

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5

6 STACEN OMAR OUTHOUMMOUNTRY,) Case No.: 1:22-cv-00104-SAB (PC)
7 Plaintiff,)
8 v.) ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW
9 N. PASCUA, et al.,) CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
10 Defendants.) DISMISSED
11) (ECF No. 24)

12 Plaintiff Stacen Omar Outhoummountry is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil
13 rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

14 On June 3, 2022, the Court discharged the previous order to show cause and granted Plaintiff
15 thirty days to file an amended complaint in accordance with the Court's prior screening order. (ECF
16 No. 24.) Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's order and the time to do so has expired.
17 Accordingly, within **fourteen (14)** days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show
18 cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with a
19 court order. Plaintiff's failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation to dismiss the
20 action.

21
22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: July 12, 2022

24 
25
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27
28